STATE OF CALIFORNIA
GAMBLING CONTROL COMMISSION

COMMISSION MEETING EXCERPT:

DIAMOND JIM'S CASINO

WIZARD GAMING, INC.

ORIGINAL

Thursday, March 26, 2009
2399 Gateway Oaks Drive
Sacramento, California 95833



Northern California Court Reporters

3610 American River Drive, Suite 114 ■ Sacramento, CA 95864-5922 (916) 485-4949 ■ Toll Free (888) 600-NCCR ■ Fax (916) 485-1735

PROCEEDINGS

	ITEM 4	B - AP	PLIC	ATION	FOR	RENEW	AL OF	STATE	
GAMBLING	LICENSE	INCLU	DING	ALL	ASSOC	CIATED	APPL	ICANTS	ANI
ENDORSEES	(PURSU	ANT TO	B&P	CODE	1987	76):			

DIAMOND JIM'S CASINO, WIZARD GAMING, INC.

Agenda Item 4B, Diamond Jim's Casino, Wizard Gaming, Inc. Staff recommends that the Commission approve the renewal state gambling license for the remainder of the licensure period from April 1, 2009 through January 31, 2011 removing the existing conditions on George Hardy, Junior's endorsed license. And representatives from both Wizard Gaming, Inc. and the Zephyr Trust are here to address --

CHAIRMAN SHELTON: Commissioners, do you want to hear from the representatives first before you form any questions?

COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Yes.

COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SHELTON: Who is going to be first? You know, you've got a lot of paper there, you're more than welcome to sit right there.

MR. ISAACMAN: Would you prefer me to sit, otherwise, I'll stand up here.

CHAIRMAN SHELTON: It's what's more comfortable to you.

1	MR. ISAACMAN: Thank you. It's more
2	comfortable to stand.
3	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: Okay.
4	MR. ISAACMAN: Thank you. My name is Allen
5	Isaacman, I represent Wizard Gaming, Inc. Good morning
6	Commissioner Shelton Chairman Shelton, Commissioner
7	Vuksich, Commissioner Shimazu.
8	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: Sir, would you please spell
9	your last name for the record?
10	MR. ISAACMAN: Sure.
11	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: I can't spell the last
12	name.
13	MR. ISAACMAN: It is I-S-A-A-C-M-A-N. I am
14	here in opposition to the application for licensing of
15	Zephyr Intervivalist (phonetic) Trust and his
16	beneficiary, George Hardy, Junior and George Deitch
17	(phonetic) as the trustee of the trust. And I would
18	like to kind of start out by basically saying something
19	that we know from the Legislature and that is that an
20	application for a license is a request for determination
21	of the applicant's character, integrity and ability to
22	engage in controlled gambling. We also know that a
23	person is not qualified to be a licensed to receive a
24	license if he is an owner of a gambling establishment
25	that has gains that are unlawful under Penal Code

Section 330. And with that kind of background, I'd like to kind of talk about the factual background of this matter here.

This matter starts, really from our view, back in the 1990's when George Hardy, Senior had an enforcement proceeding brought against him and he surrendered his license or agreed to surrender his license during that proceeding, paid a fine, and agreed that if he applied for a license again the allegations of misconduct that were alleged would be deemed proven. He was ordered, as part of the deal, he agreed as part of the deal that he would not apply for a license for a three year period, before three years, after he got rid of his interest in the Bicycle (phonetic) Club and he got rid of his interest in the Bicycle Club around 1999. So for the next three years he wasn't even allowed to apply for a license.

Nevertheless, he went out with the Wizard Group that he headed up and he found Diamond Jim's and the acquired Diamond Jim's. And most of the money that went into the financing of Diamond Jim's came from George Hardy, Senior. He lent Diamond Jim's over the next few years about \$860,000 and then because he himself could not be licensed, he started a trust. He funded the trust entirely with his own money and that's

the Zephyr Intervivalist Trust. He put in \$325,000, phenomenal trustor and the beneficiary is George Hardy, Junior. But George Hardy, Junior was unable to produce any records of income, any tax returns for a number of years, no bank statements, nothing to show that he had any assets or liabilities and he was totally financially dependant on his father during this application process which went on for a long time. It went on for six years. The license wasn't issued until the end of -- until December 2006, although the application process started in 2000.

So George Hardy, Senior, despite the fact that he wasn't licensed, went out and got this Diamond Jim's Casino. The \$325,000 that he put into the trust was used to buy shares in Wizard. Now, for the other shareholders, that would have constituted about 32% of the shares. Instead, he ended up with 42% of the shares, 41.95%. So Hardy was able to get, Senior, was able to get another 10%, approximate 10% of the shares just by grabbing it because he was in a control position. So because of his efforts, because he was really the head person here, he ended up getting the shares cheaper than anybody else because he's the one that put it together.

Now, he got around the licensing requirement

that would normally be imposed on somebody in the situation by setting up this trust. He said, I want to take care of my son. Now, you wonder why it is a trust would be set up in the first place. George Hardy, today, Junior, is in his 40's. He was in his 30's at the time the trust was set up. It wasn't that he was a minor child, he was an adult. The question is why would Senior ever set up a trust in the first place. Well, I think the answer is obvious, he sets up a trust because he wants to control things. It's his casino in his mind and he wants to be able to make sure that those shares, which is the largest block of shares in the casino, gets voted the way Senior wants.

1.3

Now, during this licensing process, if you go back and look at the correspondence in the file, and by the way, we submitted and I understand it hasn't gotten to the Commissioners, we submitted on the 13th or 14th of March, this brief and we did it, which has a lot of exhibits, a lot of documentation, that support all the things that I'm saying today, and it says a few other things, and we did it in a way that we were led to believe was a timely way. We were told that if we got it in by the date that we got it in by that it would be considered. I'm told this morning that it has not been considered, and that the Commissioners not only have not

received it, but have not been informed of its contents
We also more recently submitted a declaration of Chande:
Joshi with exhibits which is in opposition or in comment
on the report that was provided by the staff. We
understand that hasn't been considered either. But
getting back to the background of this, throughout this
application process, if you look at who was the one
who's out front trying to get the license issued to
Zephyr Intervivalist Trust, it's always Senior. Senior
is writing letters to the Commission, he's writing
letters to the Division, he's writing letters to the
trustee of the trust, and he writes a letter to Harlan
Goodson who was he director of the gambling enforcement
at the time, complaining about the request that Junior
be interviewed. Senior thought it was outrageous that
Junior, this trustee, this beneficiary, excuse me, this
beneficiary would be interviewed by the Commission as
part of this process of issuing a license. And he ends
up saying how can some of you people sleep at night.

Now, the point I make is that all these comments are always from Senior because it's really his interest that he's looking at. And I think it's clear as time goes on and it becomes more and more clear that what we're dealing with here is a situation of form over substance. We're dealing with a man that doesn't want

to reapply for a license, wasn't eligible to apply at
the time, still wanted to have a card club in
California, and a man who, by the way now, is even less
eligible than he was a few years ago because now he
admits to owning a club and casino in Belize (phonetic)
that has gains that are unlawful under Penal Code
section 330. So he is disqualified for that reason if
he were to apply. By the way, Junior is listed either
as vice president or executive vice president of that
casino, he's one of the two directors of the club that
owns that casino. Junior and Senior are the two
directors of El Dorado Investment, Inc., which is listed
as the owner of the George Hardy Las Vegas Casino in
Belize.

Now, whether or not Junior owns a direct or indirect financial interest I cannot speak to. I don't know, I think it's a great line of inquiry and ought to be made. I do know that George Hardy Junior has no visible source of income and apparently has told the Commission through his counsel that his income comes from his father to the extent that he's not getting anything from Zephyr, his income comes from his father. And when he applied for a license during the years up to December 2006, he said, well, I don't have any job because I take care of my dad. My dad's not well, my

dad supports me. And since December 2006, we know he's come back in January 2008 and told the Commission that he is working for his dad, I think Mr. Goodson told the Commission this, that Junior is in Belize working for his dad developing a property and that his dad supports him but that Junior doesn't get any pay or any compensation. So Junior is totally dependant on his father. We also know for the last eight or nine months Junior has not been able to earn any money because of his situation down in Mexico, and I'll go into that in a little while to.

But just let me say from a factual background, all the money that's gone into Zephyr came from Senior. The money that was paid to Zephyr by Diamond Jim's, the bulk of that money has gone to Senior to pay this loan back to Senior, so the beneficiary, so far, the one who's really received the bulk of the profits that would go to that 42% interest has been George Hardy, Senior.

Now, the Commission was very reluctant to grant a license to the trust for obvious reasons, and one of the things the Commission was concerned about, of course, was this presence of Senior all over this thing, so the Commission laid down conditions on this license brand. It said that Junior may not be involved, may not have any input, influence or involvement in the

operation of Diamond Jim's, and for the next six months
or so, we didn't see much sign of Junior or Senior for
that matter except that Senior started contacting the
management and in this case, Ms. Quickie, Emily Jean
Quickie, who was also the trustee of the trust having
taken over that position from her husband who passed
away, and she was the principle managing executive and
is today at Diamond Jim's. Senior started contacting
her and said, you're not paying out enough of the
profits, you're holding back your reserve, you should
pay out almost all the profits. Now, she says to him,
we need to hold a reserve, we need to have money for
improvements, for emergencies, we need to have a fund
here, and by the way, you're not supposed to be involved
in the operation of this. And he doesn't like that.
The next thing that happens is there's a letter from his
lawyer saying that the casino is in default of its loan
agreement with me. You haven't made the payments you're
required to under the loan. So she comes to us and we
contact the lawyer and say we believe we've made every
payment required, show us the loan agreement, show us
where we've breached it. We get no response. We ask
again.

COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Is it the loan from the loan for the trust who are gaining or -- I'm not sure

1	what you're talking about.
2	MR. ISAACMAN: Thank you for asking that. The
3	loan is from Senior directly to Diamond Jim's.
4	COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Okay.
5	MR. ISAACMAN: There are two loans, there's a
6	loan to the trust of \$325,000, which ballooned to over
7	\$500,000 because of interest. And then there's a loan
8	to Diamond Jim's of \$860,000, and that was the loan he
9	was complaining about after being told that we're not
10	going to distribute 100% of the profits. The response
11	to the request for the loan papers ultimately, after we
12	kept asking for them, was, well, we can't find them, we
13	don't have them. So that issue went away. But
14	clearly
15	COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: So isn't that \$860,000,
16	is that still an outstanding loan?
17	MR. ISAACMAN: It's still an outstanding loan.
18	COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Okay.
19	MR. ISAACMAN: It's the balances paid down to
20	some extent, I don't know what the number is off the top
21	of my head, we can supply that.
22	COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Yeah, I'm just worried
23	do you know what the terms were of the loan or the terms
24	of payback, I mean, when it should have been paid off?

There was an installment

MR. ISAACMAN:

25

1	payment plan put into effect, which, I believe, started
2	once the licensing was completed, and there had been
3	payments made but I just don't know the exact amount at
4	this time.
5	MS. MACHUCHI: Excuse me. It's our
6	understanding that the loan is about \$150,000.
7	COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Okay.
8	MR. ISAACMAN: So at this point, Senior's ire
9	had been aroused and so the next thing that happened
10	within a month or two after this is that there was a
11	January 10th Commission hearing. And at that hearing,
12	Senior was there, Junior was there, and George Deitch
13	was there, and Mr. Goodson on behalf of the Hardy's
14	stood up and asked that the conditions be removed on
15	Junior. And the Commission said, why do you want them
16	removed? And I think the answer is significant. It's
17	significant for what's omitted as well.

The answer was that, well, Junior just wants to be able to be able to know what's going on, he wants to be able to listen in on meetings of the shareholders, he wants to be able to review papers, and that's it. He's not looking to run things, he just wants to know what's going on with his asset.

Now, what wasn't said, and a perfect opportunity to be said, was, well, Junior wants the

conditions removed because the management is ripping off or engaging in some unfair practices or improper business practices at the casino. That wasn't said, that would have been the perfect opportunity to say that if that was something they were concerned about. And what also wasn't said was that our trustee, my trustee, was breaching her fiduciary duties. He could have said, Ms. Quickie wasn't doing what she was supposed to be doing, and for that reason I want the conditions removed. That wasn't said.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

He just wants to have a little more information about what's going on supposedly. Commission said, you know, when we decided to give you a license we were on the fence, I'm paraphrasing, we were on the fence about this, and had we had to make a choice between giving you a license with no conditions and giving you no license, we probably wouldn't have given you a license so the conditions were very important to us and we're denying that and if you want to go through the application process, you know, go ahead and do that. Within an hour, and I think from the same location as the Commission hearing, a fax was sent to Jean Quickie, you're fired as trustee. The new trustee is George And within four days of that, a letter goes out Deitch. from George Deitch to all the shareholders saying as the

controlling over 25% of the shares, which is what the bylaws require, I'm calling a special shareholders meeting. And the purpose of the meeting is to replace the Board of Directors. So this is a clear attempt to take over Diamond Jim's. So the Hardys and Deitch having been frustrated by the independence of the existing trustee and by the management said we're going to take over Diamond Jim's. And having been frustrated by the Commission saying we're not going to lift he conditions, this is the end run that they do.

Now, the notice was responded to by the management and the management recognized that Mr. Deitch wasn't authorized by law to vote those shares and brought a declaratory relief action asking the court to confirm that the shares did not need to be transferred and that money that would otherwise go to the trust did not at that point have to be paid out to Mr. Deitch since he was not licensed as a trustee and did not otherwise comply with the requirements of law as a trustee. And the Commission issued a letter saying that you're not to pay out the money and don't transfer the share until and unless Mr. Deitch is licensed.

Nevertheless, there were four or five, I think five, different attempts to get the Superior Court in

Los Angeles and different departments to order that the money be transferred, despite what the law requires and despite what the Commission's letter. So this is just another instance that, you know, Hardy Senior isn't going to stop at nothing to get control over this casino.

1.3

I think that kind of brings us up to the current events really, the most recent things, and that is, is there any reason to think today that George Hardy, Junior has satisfied his burden of proving that he's really entitled to have his license renewed, has he demonstrated his good character.

Now, I know there's a sensitivity about mentioning somebody has been arrested. But the reality is that George Hardy, Junior is in jail for attempted murder and undisputedly, undisputedly, crossed international borders with a gun and with his guards chasing patrons of the casino in Las Vegas. Now, one of the patrons got shot four times, there's no dispute about this. You may have, you know, questions, is he going to get convicted or not of the offense and I'm not here to argue that. But there is no dispute about the fact that there was a shoot out and that he led a group of people from the casino in hot pursuit of two Mexican nationals across the border from Belize in Mexico and

for the last almost nine months he's been sitting in a
jail in Mexico. His trial is ongoing. I know this
because Hardy Senior has told that to Kern County. He
told it to the sheriff and told it the Deputy City
Attorney John Irvy (phonetic) that the trial is ongoing
now. And one of the things that we think should be
asked is we think the parties should be asked to produce
information about what happened there. We think that
Hardy should be asked to produce information about the
real ownership of this casino down there and what
ownership, direct or indirect, we know that he knows how
to set up trusts, that Hardy knows how to set up trusts,
what indirect ownership does Junior have in this?

But any event, we know that because of his present circumstances, Junior hasn't earned any money since last July. So what's the point of that? The point of that is what we have from the beginning in this process is a beneficiary who is totally financially dependant on Hardy Senior, and yet Hardy Senior [sic] doesn't have to come forward to be licenced. He's totally financially dependant and presumably under the control of Hardy Senior. And he has the largest interest in Diamond Jim's through this trust and he's demonstrated by this letter that they sent calling for a special shareholders meeting that as soon as he gets the

chance he's going to take over Diamond Jim's, which means that Hardy Senior will then control Diamond Jim's.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, if the Commission wants Hardy Senior to control Diamond Jim's, let him come forward, let Senior come forward and go through the licensing process. mean, he put most of the money in, you know, one can understand why he wants to control it because it is largely his money. But he shouldn't be able to get around the licensing requirements simply by setting up a trust where his totally dependant son who lives with him, who gets money from him, and according to him, doesn't even get a paycheck, according to Junior's representative, Junior doesn't even get a paycheck, he's just supported by his father. There was no evidence of income and who has this ownership interest through a trust, he shouldn't be able to get around the licencing requirements through this kind of sham. I mean, somebody involved in Las Vegas gaming should not be able to come and set up a trust for his child, adult child no less, in California, fund it, and end up owning a card club that way.

Finally, we think that the Commission ought to consider that, and as I say it's undisputed, somebody who is operating a casino like Junior was doing down in Belize and chases with firearms some patrons across the

border is not suitable to engage in controlled gambling in California. So he shouldn't be licensed at all either with restrictions or without restrictions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, just a couple of things and I'll finish, and I appreciate the time that you've given me. staff has made recommendations in the report and as I've mentioned we've submitted a declaration to explain why we think there are at least mischaracterizations in there, and one of the things it says that the staff states is that restrictions were imposed because there were concerns regarding Hardy, Junior's failure to file tax returns and because Ms. Ouickie testified that Junior had no business sense, in effect. So it kind of puts it on Ms. Quickie as the one who is kind of pushing for these restrictions, and that is a mantra by the way, that is a theme that the Hardys say. They say that these conditions were imposed because Chander Joshi (phonetic) who was here and Ms. Quickie got together and got the Commission to put these conditions on.

And they, in fact, Hardy, Senior went and visited John Irvy, the Deputy City Attorney, and the sheriff a couple of weeks ago, and there's a tape of his conversation and we have the tape and we can make it available, the city attorney might have already made it available. And during that, he said that Chander Joshi,

because of his connections in his past working at the Department of Justice was able to poison the well with the Commission, and that's why the conditions were imposed on Junior.

Now, we know that that's not true at all. The conditions were imposed because he has somebody for a six year process wasn't able to show any income, any assets, any liabilities, totally dependant on his father who was somebody whose license was removed at an enforcement proceeding, or required to be removed, and there was just a great hesitation about licensing him.

And incidently, one of the other things that kind of struck us as reporting, and I'll leave that, is that the report does say that Mr. Goodson's letter implies questionable business practices associated with Emily Quickie and Chander Joshi and that this information has been forwarded to the Bureau for investigation. What's striking to us is that in contrast there's absolutely no mention of Junior's traveling across in this hot pursuit with guns blazing the border into Mexico, there's no mention of that at all, there's no mention about his active involvement at the casino in Belize, they even have a picture that they put up there in Belize, and it's in our exhibit book by the way, of Junior giving an award to somebody who won a

jackpot or something, and Junior is mentioned as an owner of the casino. Now, I don't know if he's really an owner or not, but that's what the picture says. But the point is that that's no even mentioned and nobody is even asking for an investigation of that, as far as we know. Maybe there's things going on we don't know, but as far as we know that's it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So it kind of leaves us with these open questions really, and one of the questions is, why was the trust even formed. As I've mentioned before, you're talking about an adult. Why would you form a trust for a person in his 30's and now his 40's unless you're trying to control. And of course, who really formed it, it's Senior who formed it, it's his money. And why doesn't the conduct of Junior warrant at least an investigation. And if it's true as Hardy Senior has told the sheriff that the trial is ongoing, and as i understand it, in Mexico the trial goes on for a period of time, the people can submit things in writing rather than come in and testify, if that's really ongoing, why would you want to issue a license at this time when in a matter of days or weeks he could end up being convicted for something that would be disqualifying, either a felony or either a misdemeanor involving a firearm. Either one of which, under section 12236 of the

Regulations, makes a person ineligible for a license.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I guess, oh, by the way, one other thing which I should mention is there was some concern, in fact even it looked like a recommendation of the people writing the reports to the Commission back in, I think most recently in 2006, saying that the way the trust is set up the successor beneficiary to Junior is the Hardy Foundation, owner of the trust. And the Hardy Foundation is run by George Hardy, and that's not acceptable so the trust should have to give up its shares. Now, I may be confusing 2000 and 2006, well, this issue stayed that entire time. But in any event, I know that in 2006 there is a report that refers to that from the Department of Justice as I recall. And so the trust apparently was amended. And the amendment was that the successor beneficiaries would be Jennifer Hardy, Junior's sister, and Robert Quickie remaining as a successor beneficiary.

The situation is that both Jennifer and Robert Quickie are deceased. So now we have a situation where, apparently under the law, the heir to Junior would be his father, and in that situation you're back where we were before and if it wasn't acceptable then for Senior to be a successor beneficiary, why is it acceptable now.

But, you know, having said all these things

1	and I think they're all important, well, one thing that
2	is clear from all this is that the picture that's
3	painted is a picture of George Hardy Junior wanting to
4	own a card club, despite the fact that he wasn't even
5	allowed to apply for a license at the time, he went out
6	and acquired one, he set up a trust for his son, his son
7	is totally under his control, there's no real division
8	of assets or income there. His son is dependant on his
9	financially, money going to the trust is in fact under
10	the control of Senior, and it should not be tolerated.
11	If he's going to be allowed to be involved, Senior
12	should have to submit for a license. Thank you very
13	much for your attention.
14	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: Thank you.
15	MR. GOODSON: Mr. Chairman. Commissioners. mv

MR. GOODSON: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, my name is Harlan Goodson, I'm here on behalf of George Hardy, Junior, beneficiary the Zephyr Intervivalist Trust, the trust itself, and George Deitch, the trustee.

I'm going to cover some of these points backwards just to take care of some of the comments made by Mr Isaacman.

With respect to mentioning of the incident in Mexico, I object to any mention of that whatsoever on the basis of the California Decisional Law which specifically says that arrest information alone cannot

be used for licensing purposes, and that's a Central Valley case as counsel is aware of, and so I will object to the use any of that information as part of the decision making process here.

1.0

Going back, we've covered this a number of times, and I don't want to occupy too much of the Commission's time on this, but I do want to address some very specific points, and I'd like to begin with the history.

First of all, the application that was filed by Mr. Hardy, Junior was filed in 2003, not 2000. In 2006, after three years of investigation, the Department of Justice sent its recommendation to this Commission. And in that recommendation, the Department of Justice specifically said that they found no information that would lead the Commission, or the Department of Justice to believe that any of the applicants, any, including Mr. Hardy, Junior, was unsuitable to hold a state gambling license.

In their investigation, the Department of
Justice considered all of these points that Mr. Isaacman
made and allegations about the involvement of Mr. Hardy.
Action of its investigation, the Department of Justice
was satisfied there was no evidence, there was no
documentary evidence, there was no proof that Mr. Hardy,

Senior had any involvement in Diamond Jim's Casino or Wizard Gaming. At that time, they considered the loans and they considered the true facts which is that Wizard Gaming went to Mr. Hardy, Senior and asked him for the \$896,000 loan because they couldn't secure money from a commercial source. And there was an amortization schedule that was set up, a payment plan, and it was not based upon the revenues of the casino, it was based upon the schedule itself. In other words, X amount of dollars to be paid out over a period of time to satisfy the loan, no interest. This is exactly the same analysis that this body uses in determining whether or not a landlord has an interest in a gambling operation. It's the same kind of analysis. There's no involvement whatsoever by Mr. Hardy, Senior.

1.0

Now, this body considered the licenses of Wizard Gaming, Hardy, Junior and the shareholders of Wizard Gaming in August of 2006. At that time, it was former Commissioner Cruz that brought up the question whether or not the arrangement that Mr. Hardy, Junior had with his father wherein he was living at home, caring for his father and he was caring for his then alive but drug addicted sister, whether or not that constituted a taxable event, whether that was bartering for services, and whether or not bartering constituted a

taxable event and if it did, then did Mr. Hardy, Junior violate tax laws by failing to file income tax reports. That question went unanswered, and it went unanswered because there was nobody available at the time to speak on Mr. Hardy, Junior. In fact, it was not when we met in San Diego, it was still on the table. Well, since then, Mr. Hardy, Junior's accountant has written a letter which is in your file informing us that under the arrangement that Mr. Hardy, Junior had with his father did not constitute a taxable event, there was no requirement to file income tax. And so the question that was raised by former Commissioner Cruz has not been answered.

There was a question that was asked in San Diego, and it was you, Commissioner Vuksich, that asked the question and it had to do with capacity, Mr. Hardy, Junior's capacity. And I believe the question came about because of the testimony of Emily Quickie. It wasn't that anybody was suggesting that Emily Quickie had gotten and there forced a decision to impose the condition, it was that her testimony and the characterizations that she made caused the Commissioners to question whether or not Mr. Hardy, Junior had the capacity to be licensed under the Gambling Control Act. Was he one who had demonstrated the ability to be

associated with controlled gaming, a gambling establishment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

At that time, Mr. Chairman, I committed to you and the Commissioners to work closely with your staff and we have met and we have communicated and we have provided your staff with documentary evidence of every single question that's been asked of us, including the question that you, Commissioner Vuksich, had asked about capacity. And we have shown that Mr. Hardy, Junior has held positions. He was in the United States Air Force, he has an honorable discharge. He occupied positions of trust management and supervision at the Bicycle Club when his father owned the club. He now occupies the position of management in Belize. In fact, in a communication received that was given out by Ms. Quickie to the shareholders of Wizard Gaming, when it looked like Mr. Hardy, Junior was going to have the conditions removed from his license, she said, finally, we're going to have somebody that knows how to run a casino. own words prove the capacity of Mr. Hardy and meeting the standard on the Gambling Control Act.

COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: Mr. Goodson, if I might.

MR. GOODSON: Yes, please.

COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: I think I need to

_	craffity. My affival at the question was not based on
2	Ms. Quickie's testimony at all.
3	MR. GOODSON; Okay.
4	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: It was based on other
5	patterns and behavior that were made apparent in
6	materials I had before me for the meetings in 2006 and
7	2008. And in fact, her testimony in 2006 is what
8	actually softened this Commissioner into considering the
9	conditions that were proposed by Commissioner Cruz to
10	allow Mr. Hardy, Junior to receive passive income from
11	the trust. Otherwise, I would have been in a different
12	position on my vote.
13	MR. GOODSON: Okay, and I stand corrected on
14	that. You know, we're trying to reconstruct things
15	based upon conversations we had
16	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: Yeah, luckily I was
17	there.
18	MR. GOODSON: And you're right, and I stand
19	corrected on that.
20	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: Okay.
21	MR. GOODSON: But the point being, the
22	questions that were asked of us and the responses we
23	gave were in an attempt to satisfy the notion that
24	somehow he was he did not have capacity to be

licensed under the Gambling Control Act.

25

The reasons,

- 1	obviously, he didn't know all of them. Thank you for
2	clarifying that.
3	There has been a lot of testimony about
4	whether or not Mr. Hardy, Senior is behind all of this,
5	and there has been a question raised as to why somebody
6	would create a trust for the benefit of an adult child.
7	Family planning, the same as you would do or I would do.
8	It makes no difference what the age of my children are.
9	If I want to plan for their future and want to ensure
10	that they have something after my passing, the trust is
11	the vehicle I would use and I'll leave it at that.
12	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: May I ask another here.
13	MR. GOODSON: Sure.
14	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: On that point. At that
15	time, there was a daughter, and I'm unclear as to the
16	relationship or status, it sounds like she's current
17	deceased.
18	MR. GOODSON: She's current deceased. Mr.
19	Hardy had two living children.
20	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: Right.
21	MR. GOODSON: She was a beneficiary originally
22	and the Bureau said
23	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: Under Zephyr?
24	MR. GOODSON: Under Zephyr, exactly.
25	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: Okay.

MR. GOODSON: And what the Bureau said was
that because of her status she would have to apply for
licensing too. And so the trust and its beneficiary was
changed. Mr. Isaacman is correct that a contingent
beneficiary was the Hardy Fund and that was taken out,
you know, that was the document was created and then
it was provided to the Bureau, or I believe the Division
at the time for investigation. The Division came back
and said, if you're going to do it this way you're going
to have to be licenced, they said, no, you know, we
don't need to be licensed, we're not going to be
involved in gambling so they changed the trust document.
The same as any other applicant does when now the
Bureau finds issues that trigger licensing events, and
it's no different than any other application.

б

Getting to the report, and, you know, and I'm just, you know, I'm going to leave a lot of that stuff out there because you've dealt with it now for going on how many ever years, three years, four years, whatever it is. And a lot of what has been said has been said in the past. And we provided responses, you have our documentary evidence, you have all of our reports and our responses, we've been working with the County of Kern, Mr. Irvy, who actually is Deputy County Counsel, not city attorney, is well aware of everything that is

going on. We're aware of the meeting that county counsel and sheriff's Department of Kern County had with Mr. Hardy, Senior, not involved in it, he's not our client, that's for him to deal with. He has no interest in this gambling establishment and so we're not involved in that. Mr. Irvy was kind enough to inform me and provide me with the same copy of the taped conversation that Mr. Blackman and Mr. Isaacman has. You know, it has no bearing on what we're doing here.

1.0

We have before us an application for licensure for renewal licensure and a recommendation to remove the conditions based upon your staff's own conclusion after reviewing all of the documents that were presented to them, all of the evidence including declarations from Mr. Deitch, the trustee of the Zephyr Trust. After reviewing all of that and considering all of the information that has gone before and presented by the opposition, concluding that the basis for the conditions no longer exist. We concur. We think the conditions should be removed.

I note that in staff's report that there is an in the alternative recommendation to refine the conditions. We suggest that that leaves Mr. Hardy, Junior in no better situation. Under statutory law and decisional law in California, the trust beneficiary has

an absolute right to, for lack of better terms, a friendly trustee. Mr. Hardy, Junior has already been prejudiced by the failings of the former trustee. To now put additional or modified conditions on his license just puts him in the same place.

The whole purpose behind asking to have the conditions removed, as I said in San Diego, was to allow the trust beneficiary to protect the trust interest, to protect his own interest. The way to do it is to make sure that things like an unsecured \$300,000 non-gaming related loan isn't made. Forty-two percent of that money should have gone to the trust to make sure that a consulting contract for another \$300,000 with a poisoned pill in it that allows for the first \$300,000 loan to be forgiven in the event the current president of Wizard Gaming is removed to mean that those kinds of things don't occur, to protect the interest of the trust, protect the interest of the beneficiary, and the conditions and even the alternative conditions put shackles on Mr. Hardy, Junior.

We had conversations with legal and with licensing staff. We have waived the notice requirement for consideration of an alternative, which is that conditions be placed on the trust to satisfy the loan. I understand there's a cloud and the cloud is called

George Hardy, Senior. His prior conduct permeate this room and every conversation we have about Wizard Gaming and about his son. We understand that. We don't deny that. But the son should not be required to pay for the sins of the father. We wouldn't do that to our own children, why would we do it to Mr. Hardy, Junior? And so what we are suggesting, in consultation with counsel and with your licensing staff, is that notion that let's get Mr. Hardy, Senior out of the picture totally. And how do you do it, pay off the loans. We think that's a reasonable request on the part of the Commission.

Having said that, we don't want to set up a scenario where we can't comply with the condition. And so we would ask that if conditions are going to be placed on the trust, calling for repayment of the loan back to Hardy, Senior's trust, that one, Wizard be required to make all distributions due to the trust. That two, Wizard provide the trust and the Commission with a full accounting. That three, Wizard provide the trust with all records, documentary records including drop box accounts, financial statements, profit and loss statements, all the kinds of things so that we can test, independently test the voracity of the information that Wizard provides us. Clearly, we don't have a whole lot of trust in them right now.

We also suggest that once these first
precatory steps are satisfied, that there be a period of
time to allow Zephyr and allow the Commission to
evaluate the solvency of the trust to make sure the
repayment of the loan doesn't bankrupt the trust, it
doesn't put the trust in a worse position. The trust
has an obligation to the beneficiary but the trust also
wants the trust wants to get rid of that loan. So we
want to make sure that there's enough money to do it and
if there isn't enough money, then allow us the
opportunity to come back to the Commission so that we
can figure out some sort of repayment schedule. We
don't want this to go on (inaudible), we don't think the
loan should be there forever, we understand your
feelings about Mr. Hardy, Senior and the cloud that
hover over this little casino in the Central Valley, we
get that, we want to remove that.

We think that it's also appropriate to put a condition on Wizard's license. Wizard owes money to Mr. Hardy, Senior too. Wizard knew in 2003 whether or not Mr. Hardy, Senior had any involvement in that casino because Wizard took out the loan. If Wizard believed that Mr. Hardy, Senior was involved in Wizard Gaming or the casino, they had an obligation to tell you. They had an obligation to tell the Bureau and they had an

obligation to tell the county and they did not do so
because he wasn't involved. Having said that, the loan
still exists, it's \$150,000 or thereabout. We believe
it's appropriate to put a condition on Wizard's license
calling for the repayment of the loan.

At the moment when those two loans are satisfied, there is no Mr. Hardy, Senior to talk about with respect to this little casino. Thank you very much for your time.

MR. ISAACMAN: Can I have just 25 seconds to respond?

CHAIRMEN SHELTON: Do the Commissioners have an opportunity to talk later? Please, I'm being factitious. I'm sorry.

MR. ISAACMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just really quickly, first of all, let me make it clear we're not asking that any conclusions be drawn by virtue of an arrest, and we're not saying that an arrest alone should be used for anything. We're all saying that it's absurd to say we have to hide our heads in the sand when there's undisputed evidence that Hardy, Junior was crossing an international border with guns. There's no question about that. And that should at least be looked into. We should at least look into that.

The comment was made by my friend, Mr.

Τ	Goodson, that the Department of Justice considered all
2	the points raised by me. In fact, that's not correct
3	because I was just told this morning that our brief
4	wasn't considered at all. So the recommendation was
5	written without considering our brief, before they got
6	our brief and there's been no supplement. And as you
7	can see through the thickness of this, there's a lot of
8	in material here.
9	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: Well, there is a lot of
10	material. My question would be why is it a last minute
11	submission?
12	MR. ISAACMAN: Good question, Mr. Chairman,
13	because we called and we said when do we have to have it
14	in by, we were given a date, we got it in by that date,
15	and we're told today that
16	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: What was the date that you
17	surrendered it to the Commission?
18	MR. ISAACMAN: I think it was the I think
19	we sent that out on the 13th, I think, or 14th of March.
20	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: Of March?
21	MR. ISAACMAN: Of March, and we were never
22	told that it had to be any time before that. I'm sorry,
23	I mean, I apologize because I understand
24	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: Well, I can tell you now
25	for educational purposes, documents of this nature go to

the Commissioners for review and we ask for four to six weeks or so after everyone has looked at licensing and it's gone through the Department of Justice. are not quick reviews we do. They're very thorough. There would be no way a document of that nature we would review in less than four weeks. MR. ISAACMAN: I understand that. CHAIRMAN SHELTON: So I'm sorry if you were misinformed.

MR. ISAACMAN: Yeah. And in terms of this trust business, the idea that this was kind of family planning maybe for tax reasons or whatever, I think you can find out quickly enough that the kinds of intervalist trusts that are set up to keep property out of one's estate is not this kind of a situation. That's not what this kind of trust is. And I think that's just the wrong explanation for why this trust is set up.

This trust is clearly set up so that the person setting it up can keep control over it, and Mr. Goodson is right that there is a cloud over Senior — over this proceeding because of Senior, but it's Senior whose money has been involved, it's Senior who is making appearances and complaining about things, it's Senior who met with the county counsel. And you're not going to get Senior out of the picture completely in any way

1 other than not having the trust be licensed. 2 way to get Senior in a legitimate form and have form 3 match reality as to require Senior to come in and be 4 licensed. Because even if the loans are paid off, 5 Junior is still with Senior, Junior is still under Senior's thumb, and Senior still calls the shots. It б wasn't Junior who met with county counsel this year, it 8 was Senior. Thank you. 9 CHAIRMAN SHELTON: Thank you. Commissioner? 10 COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Yeah, Mr. Isaacman, can 11 I ask you some questions?

MR. ISAACMAN: Oh, I'm sorry.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Yeah. I think Mr.

Goodson touched it, when you were talking I was thinking of this too, but you represent Wizard Gaming and, I mean, they knew about all these financial transactions in the beginning, what changed then? I mean, it sounded like they were okay with it at one time.

MR. ISAACMAN: That's a good question, and I think that probably the fairest explanation is that there was a bit of naivety, we're not dealing with lawyers when we're talking about Jean Quickie, it was actually Bob Quickie who was running things at the time, he passed away. He was a good friend. He was a good friend of Mr. -- of Senior, of Mr. Hardy, Senior. And

maybe there wouldn't be any problem today if he hadn't passed away. But what happened is that Mr. Quickie passed away and Ms. Quickie took over and she was independent.

1

2

3

4

5

б

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And of course, nobody was licenced other than Bob Quickie and Mr. Levinson (phonetic) in the early So Mr. Quickie passes away in 2005, Ms. Quickie takes over, everybody gets licensed at the end of 2006, everybody in September except of Junior who gets licensed in December 2007, is the first year we see what's going to happen with everybody being licensed. And here you have Ms. Quickie being independent, not taking direction from Senior, and that's when the problems arose. That's when it became clear to Ms. Quickie that Senior isn't somebody who is just making a loan, Senior is trying to control the shots. Senior says you have to pay out the distributions, you can't hold a reserve. You have to pay this loan faster. That's what happened.

And so it became clear from the accumulation of events in 2007 and then in January of 2008 when they come in there and ask to get the conditions lifted and then fire her as a trustee and say we're going to take it over, that's when it became clear that what they thought, maybe in a naive fashion, was really -- there's

going to be a real trust with the past beneficiary isn't the case. Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Yeah, what would happen then if we did not license the trust, what would happen to the shares?

MR. ISAACMAN: What would happen to the shares is that, first of all, the monies allocable to the shares would continue to be kept in a separate account so that they would go to whoever was — ended up being entitled to own those shares, those shares could be offered for sale, they could be sold at an appropriate time, the money would continue to build up. The Hardy people would get the benefit of that over time by selling the shares to somebody who's qualified to be licenced, and you'd have a licensed person. And if it wanted to be Hardy, Senior, let Hardy, Senior come in and get licensed, but a real person, not a figure.

COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Okay, I have one more. Okay, the last time we were here it was about Mr. Deitch being the trustee and we had gotten some information, I think Mr. Blackman was here and testified, and I went back and looked at them because it caused me some concern about what Mr. Hardy, Senior was doing in terms of influencing, but when I went back and looked, a lot of it looked like it went back to the financial

situations with -- I know there was a parking lot and some rent and there was also the repayment of the loan and the repayment to the trust, it wasn't so much that I saw him trying to influence the trustee, the son, he just wanted his money paid back. If all that money was paid back, wouldn't all of his, I don't want to say meddling, but his inquiries and those things, wouldn't those go away?

MR. ISAACMAN: Well --

COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: It looked like a lot of it was tied to the financial and just getting the payment back and, you know, going on.

MR. ISAACMAN: Issues did come about the parking lot, there's no question about it, and he did get paid the rent he was required to get paid. Then he offered to sell it for \$500,000 and Ms. Quickie and the Board said no and Mr. Deitch said, no, go ahead and sell it and try to get the other shareholders to accept Hardy, Senior's, offer, it's all true. But the reality of this thing is, you know, there isn't any question, you can't get a clear contrast between Junior and Senior. Junior is somebody who apparently doesn't work at all other than what his father — does what his father tells him to do. This is a lifetime. He came in here with no assets and no liabilities, no bank

accounts. He's worked for his father at the Bicycle
Club, and now he works down at the Belize Casino when
he, you know, when he's out of custody, he's working
down there. He's one of the two directors with his
father. His father controls him. Hardy, Senior looks
at this casino as his casino. That's the reality of it
and the problems didn't surface really until Jean
Quickie said, you know, it's not your casino, it isn't,
you know, you don't own the 42%, you don't control that
That's when the problems came up.

Even if he gets paid back the money that the trust owes him and that the casino owes him, he's still going to view it as his business, and maybe he'll be more subtle and maybe he won't be, but you can be sure that whoever is a trustee is going to be doing Senior's bidding. And it's foolish to think otherwise, I mean, we're fooling ourselves if we try to pretend that's not the case.

COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Well, was there any incidents then where he was trying to urge him to take on, I don't know, to do something other than just repaying him the money that was owed to him?

MR. ISAACMAN: Yes. Yes, he demanded of Jean Quickie that she pay out close 100% of the profits of Wizard, of Diamond Jim's

COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Okav.

MR. ISAACMAN: Okay, now, a lender doesn't have any right to make that kind of demand, a shareholder has that kind right. If I owned shares and I'm not getting as much of the profits as I think I'm entitled to, but the company is holding back money, I have a right to make that demand. I understand his demand. He disagrees. He doesn't think that whoever is running it should be holding back that money for improvements or emergencies or whatever. He wants it all paid out and he said I ran the Bicycle Club and I paid out close to 100%, you should be paying that out. That's what got him angry.

COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: But that went back too because he wants to have his loan paid off. I'm asking was there any like business, we should be running this game, or we should be, you know, contracting with that vendor or we -- those other things. I agree he should not be in there and asking all those questions, but it kind of seems like it's all connected to pay me the money and I'm thinking if you pay me the money then he'll go away and then he won't have all those inquiries and you could not be so worried about it.

MR. ISAACMAN: There was a person hired to manage or consult, a guy named Indy Turner. He

1	complained about that. He came in and complained to Ms.
2	Quickie about that, you shouldn't hire this guy, he's
3	not the right guy, get rid of him. So this was in 2005
4	I think it was, maybe 2006, one of the two.
5	COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Okay.
6	MR. ISAACMAN: So he's been on the scene the
7	whole time. He's always telling what he thinks.
8	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: There's a lot of hearsay
9	here.
10	COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Sure.
11	MR. ISAACMAN: All you have to do is look at
12	your own correspondence and see who's the one that's
13	stepping forward.
14	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: Yeah, I don't want to bust
15	any balloons here, but I want things that have been
16	looked at, reported, they're on paper, been
17	investigated. You can go field and say anything you
18	want to, until it's verified, we don't know if it's true
19	or not. So for the Commissioner to try and make a
20	decision on hearsay is we're not going to do that.
21	We're just not going to do it.
22	MR. ISAACMAN: Sure, and I understand -
23	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: So only address what's in
24	the reports and before the Commission, please.

I understand.

MR. ISAACMAN:

25

And that's why

1	we submitted our brief and our
2	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: I understand that.
3	MR. ISAACMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
4	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: May I ask a question, a
5	quick one?
6	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: Go ahead.
7	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: May I ask a quick
8	question, any of you. Had these requests for payment of
9	the loan, etcetera, etcetera, been made by the trustee
10	of the Zephyr Trust as shareholder? Or only by a Hardy?
11	Mr. Goodson?
12	MR. GOODSON: Commissioner Vuksich, which
13	payments are you talking about, because there's more
14	than one loan here?
15	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: These issues that Mr.
16	Isaacman has been bringing up.
17	MR. GOODSON: The one request for payment on a
18	loan that I'm aware of is a request from Mr. Hardy,
19	Senior to Emily Quickie for payment on the loan that he
20	made to Wizard Gaming, this was the original \$826,000 or
21	96, I don't remember the exact figure. That loan, which
22	Mr. Hardy, Senior gave to Wizard Gaming at the moment
23	when Wizard was unable to secure funding from a
24	commercial source, that's the only communication I'm

aware of for repayment on a loan.

1	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: Okay.
2	MR. GOODSON: The issue of repayment of the
3	loan to the trust is one that I have personally had
4	conversations about with your staff as well as the
5	County of Kern.
6	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: Okay.
7	MR. GOODSON: This is not a new idea, this is
8	something that we
9	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: Have any payments been
10	made on that loan at all?
11	MR. GOODSON: Payments been made on it?
12	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: Um-hmm.
13	MR. GOODSON: I believe there has been one
14	payment on it. I believe that the loan amount was
15	originally for \$325,000 and then it ballooned up because
16	of interest and a payment was made. I don't know what
17	the outstanding balance is as of this date.
18	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: Has Mr. Hardy, Junior
19	been receiving regular income from the Zephyr Trust?
20	MR. GOODSON: From the Zephyr Trust, no.
21	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: What are the assets in
22	the trust?
23	MR. GOODSON: That's a question that we don't
24	have an answer to. We have been blocked from learning
25	that information. We don't know whether the

1	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: But that's the
2	trustee's issue, not Wizard's
3	MR. GOODSON: That is the trustee's issue,
4	you're right. That's the trust issue and the trustee's
5	issue.
6	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: So that's Mr. Deitch?
7	MR. GOODSON: That's Mr. Deitch. But the
8	beneficiary also has an interest in that
9	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: But that's a
10	conversation with he and the trustee.
11	MR. GOODSON: And that's a different
12	conversation, right, but the issue as to whether or not
13	distributions have been made into the trust,
14	representations have been made, the money is being held
15	in a separate account to the benefit of the trust but we
16	have no proof of that.
17	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: But that's the function
18	of the trustee to pursue that?
19	MR. GOODSON: Precisely.
20	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: Okay.
21	MR. GOODSON: Precisely. Exactly, yeah. And
22	just to speak briefly to your question, Commissioner
23	Shimazu, I think the answer to your question is
24	absolutely yes, that Mr. Hardy is out of the picture
25	once the loans are taken care of boggues it is about

this money and whether money somehow maneuvers some sort
of control mechanism to the person that the money is
owed to. And clearly that's the cloud, and I get that
and we get that. And, you know, that's the thing that
kind of stick in the craw of a lot of people and we
understand that. And it's a conversation that I've had
not only at the state level but at the county level.
The county counsel has asked the same question and we've
come up with the same resolution that if in all other
respects the trust is suitable, the trustee is suitable,
the trust beneficiary is suitable, and the only issue
has to do with, is because of the money, get rid of it.
Pay off the loans. Get rid of it. You're not going to
sever the father/son relationship. Mr. Hardy, Senior is
the father of Mr. Hardy, Junior. Mr. Hardy, Senior has
gambling running through his blood. It's all he's
known. He does it in Las Vegas and he does it in
Belize. He has no business in California.

Mr. Hardy, Junior works for his father. We have provided staff with most recent tax filings of behalf of Mr. Hardy, Junior that demonstrates he claims the benefit of that work in Belize, the food, the housing and the stipend. He claims it as taxable income. He's an open book. There is no reason here, as your own staff pointed out, the basis for the conditions

1	no longer exist.
2	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: Excuse me, does he also
3	claim the 510 day exemption?
4	MR. GOODSON: I'm sorry?
5	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: There's a
6	MR. GOODSON: The housing exemption?
7	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: No, there's a 510, if I
8	live outside of the country for 510 continuous days, I
9	don't pay taxes to a certain amount and then everything
10	over that I do.
11	MR. GOODSON: You know, I don't know the
12	answer to that question, I'm not a tax attorney or an
13	accountant. I did see the
14	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: And then my other
15	question would be what is his legal status in Belize?
16	MR. GOODSON: His =-
17	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: And does he pay Belize
18	taxes?
19	MR. GOODSON: And I don't know the answer to
20	that, but I can certainly find out. If those are
21	documents that you need and questions
22	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: Well, that would go to
23	income.
24	MR. GOODSON: Clearly. But we did provide
25	staff with the federal and state filing, well, no, not

state because he's a Nevada resident, so the federal filings that showed for an income earned and it was filed as for an income earned and it was less than \$100,000 per year. But to answer your question about the exemption, I don't know the answer to that. But his accountant is a telephone call away and we can certainly find that out for you.

COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: If the purpose of the trust is to provide Mr. Hardy, Junior with income, and that is the total purpose of this trust, what are the objections to the continuation of the conditions?

Because the relationship, shareholder wise, is between the trust and Wizard.

MR. GOODSON: And the problem is that after Mr. Deitch found some troubling information out about the way Wizard's money was being spent, he alerted Mr. Hardy, Junior that perhaps the duty to the trust had been breached. In order to ensure that Mr. Hardy, Junior as the beneficiary doesn't run that risk again, we believe that the conditions need to be removed so that he can — not that he wants to come to California, and not that he wants to have any involvement in hiring or firing, but see what's going on.

And here's the issue, Commissioner, a \$300,000 loan was made, a non-gaming related loan, non-secured,

1	out of Wizard funds, 42% of that is trust money.
2	Shouldn't the trustee and the trust beneficiary at least
3	be able to review that to see whether or not that's in
4	the interest of the trust?
5	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: It's the trustee's duty
6	not the beneficiary.
7	MR. GOODSON: The problem is that it was the
8	trustee that made the loan. And the trustee used
9	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: But they changed the
10	trustee, now you have a new trustee.
11	MR. GOODSON: The trustee used, and you know
12	what, and this underscores the point that there is no
13	relationship between Deitch and Hardy. There is no
14	(inaudible) kind of conspiracy to take over this club.
15	Mr. Hardy, Junior is putting his trust in Mr. Deitch the
16	same as they did with Mr. Quickie and then Mrs. Quickie.
17	He has no way of knowing, notwithstanding the fact that
18	Mr. Deitch has the same legal obligation. As we all
19	know, legal obligations can be breached. And just to be
20	able to see documents, to at least, not to come in and
21	control, not to come in and hire, not to fire, not to do
22	any of that sort of thing, but at least know what's
23	happening with the money that's supposed to be coming
24	into the trust. You know, what's happening with it? He

has no way of having those questions answered if he's

1	blocked off from the knowledge. If the information
2	stops and can never get to him, then once again he's put
3	in a position of blind faith. He has already seen what
4	that can do. A person who is a family friend, a long
5	time business associate of his father, breached her duty
6	to him. He has no guarantee it won't happen again.
7	Now, I am not suggesting that Mr. Deitch is
8	going to breach his duty, but here on behalf of the
9	trust beneficiary, I'm saying that to put these kinds of
10	conditions on his license puts him in a box where he
11	can't see what's going on.
12	Now, once again, like your own staff said,
13	there's no basis for the conditions.
14	MR. ISAACMAN: Let me just say that we deny
15	that Ms. Quickie breached any duties, but beyond that,
16	Mr. Goodson said it all when he said you're not going to
17	separate the father and son. As long as they're
18	together, Mr. Hardy, Senior is going to control things.
19	Mr. Joshi just had a couple of comments he
20	would like to make, Commission.
21	MR. JOSHI: I was going to say good morning,
22	but I don't know if it's afternoon or not right now.
23	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: We're still in the
24	morning.

MR. JOSHI: We're still in the morning.

1	morning Chairman Shelton, Commissioners, I wanted to
2	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: State your name and spell
3	the last name for me.
4	MR. JOSHI: Chander Joshi, J-O-S-H-I.
5	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: And a?
6	MR. JOSHI: Designated agent for Wizard
7	Gaming.
8	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: Thank you.
9	MR. JOSHI: Sorry. I'm not as eloquent as
10	Mr. Isaacman or Mr. Goodson, so please forgive me. I'm
11	not a public speaker. The questions about Mr. Hardy,
12	Senior being involved, it's very naive to say if there's
13	a financial relationship and that's taken care of.
14	Therefore there will be no involvement.
15	I've been involved with Diamond Jim's Casino,
16	Wizard Gaming, since June 2000, before anybody else was
17	involved in this place. Commissioners, I guess,
18	Mr. Goodson was from the Division standpoint. For six
19	years we were put through hell. It was not involving
20	anybody else except for Mr. Hardy, Senior. In September
21	of '06, you know, we came and spoke, Ms. Quickie spoke,
22	she made the comment about, you know, lack of business
23	knowledge by Mr. Hardy, Junior. This was a lady who was

speaking on behalf of the beneficiary, speaking from her

heart, but that was similar verbiage that he gave her in

24

an email that I'm glad, Mrs. Quickie, you're taking over for your husband because I don't have business knowledge, something to that affect, I'm paraphrasing here. We would be more than happy to provide that as evidence.

I have a copy of the audio tape between Mr.

John Irvy, the sheriff's department of Kern County and

George Hardy, Senior as well as the staff, I mean,
attorney, Mr. McGonicle (phonetic), it's about a 50

minute hearing. If you listen to the audio, all he's
talking about is I'm not involved, however, this is my
opinion. I'm not involved, however, they shouldn't have
done the renovations. I'm not involved, however, why
did they make that \$300,000 note. I'm not involved,
however, how can they pay a consultant \$13,500 a month
and yet he's never on premises. Is that just worrying
about the loan? There's more to it, in his own words.
This isn't something we're creating as a document. It's
one thing to get a transcript of this, it's another
thing if you really listen to this.

I don't know if John Irvy or Mr. Goodson have provided a copy, I don't know if you're interested in listening to it, but it is interesting reading. There's a lot of negative said on here, mainly about me, mainly about Mrs. Quickie, the improprieties as they're

reported and in the report. In looking at two documents in an attorney, whether it be our attorneys or their attorneys presenting something doesn't necessarily make it so without a lot of the back up.

If there was an investigation done regarding Mr. Hardy, Junior's conditions being removed, nobody contacted me for a guy who has been involved for six years, or I'm sorry, nine years now. If there was going to be a reason why the conditions should be removed, I would think somebody from the Bureau or the Commission would have contacted me and said, you were there in September of '06, you were there in December of '06.

Mr. Goodson, I don't know if -- I'm pretty sure you didn't do it on purpose, that the other side never got an opportunity to contest the conditions, completely inaccurate.

I have emails from Debbie Youngblood after
Commissioner Cruz asked for some clarification, we had a
conference call, I spoke with both Hardy, Junior and
Senior, this is October, November of '06, before the
conditions were going to be placed. On this tape as Mr.
Isaacman stated, he says that I poisoned the well.
That's an insult saying that I can go to Debbie
Youngblood, Terri Cio, those are the two individuals I
had the conversation with, and through them, the

Commissioners can be influenced to put conditions on an individual's license. This is Hardy, Senior saying that. It's not even Junior.

So the reason I wanted to come up here, and again, I'm a very bad public speaker, I hope I'm making myself clear. I sometimes start rambling, but to hear his own words, for six, or technically nine years now, I've used myself, I'm sorry, I wanted to say one of the questions was, well, if the financial conditions are removed, there's no involvement. Asked me for my phone records from June or technically December '99 on, asked Mr. Hardy, Senior, ask Mr. Hardy, Junior for their phone records and see where the phone conversations always ended up. It was always between me and Senior.

Somebody can sit here and say well, Chander, you helped mislead the Commission. No, I use myself as a buffer whenever he wanted to have influence over the operations. I clearly identified to him that that's not his role. Nobody knows better than I do the six years of hell we had to go through.

Mr. Deitch, In Jean Quickie's home in I believe May of 2005, after Bob Quickie passed away, wanted the Zephyr Trust pulled out, there's no record of this, this was a conversation, and I know Chairman Shelton said we can only base it on fact not hearsay,

the reality is there's a lot of conversations that I'm privy to that Mr. Hardy, Senior is, Deitch is.

If we're going to do an investigation, maybe some of those conversations should be addressed. I'd be more than happy to. I realize, you know, as I said I use myself as a buffer. The 60% being distributed and not 100% or 80%, he had that conversation with me as well in May of '07, I believe. I don't know if it was before he spoke to Mrs. Quickie or after.

The renovations that we're talking about, what is it of his concern? He's a lender. If he's truly a lender, whether Wizard Gaming wastes a million dollars or it wastes ten dollars, it's not his place to say. He's saying it because he a father. You know, as Allen said and Mr. Goodson said, you can't separate the father from the son. I said that to Mr. Cruz, different words, but I said the same thing.

CHAIRMAN SHELTON: You know, I'm having a very difficult time with this conversation and I'll tell you why. If I loaned you money and you were supposed to go buy groceries and you went out and bought a new car, as a lender, you don't think I wouldn't have some concerns and ask some questions?

MR. JOSHI: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN SHELTON: I would ask questions and I

1	think any lender would, and I don't think that's what
2	this hearing is about. Our hearing is about Junior and
3	whether he should be licenced or have conditions removed
4	or not. So I'd like to move away from that and that
5	closure if you don't mind.
6	MR. JOSHI: Fair enough.
7	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: I even have my hearing aid
8	squealing.
9	MR. JOSHI: I apologize, it's probably me.
10	Any way, I wanted to make sure that I'm available, a lot
11	of mud is going to be thrown at me, it has been, but
12	that's fine.
13	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: I believe the Bureau is
13	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: I believe the Bureau is here and if they have questions and feel that they need
14	here and if they have questions and feel that they need
14 15	here and if they have questions and feel that they need to do follow up, they'd do that. I know the Commission
14 15 16	here and if they have questions and feel that they need to do follow up, they'd do that. I know the Commission employees would do the same thing. There is a lot of
14 15 16	here and if they have questions and feel that they need to do follow up, they'd do that. I know the Commission employees would do the same thing. There is a lot of information laid out here that's been before us before
14 15 16 17	here and if they have questions and feel that they need to do follow up, they'd do that. I know the Commission employees would do the same thing. There is a lot of information laid out here that's been before us before and some is new, some is not. But I think now it's time
14 15 16 17 18	here and if they have questions and feel that they need to do follow up, they'd do that. I know the Commission employees would do the same thing. There is a lot of information laid out here that's been before us before and some is new, some is not. But I think now it's time for Commissioners to move on and make some decisions
14 15 16 17 18	here and if they have questions and feel that they need to do follow up, they'd do that. I know the Commission employees would do the same thing. There is a lot of information laid out here that's been before us before and some is new, some is not. But I think now it's time for Commissioners to move on and make some decisions here.
14 15 16 17 18 19	here and if they have questions and feel that they need to do follow up, they'd do that. I know the Commission employees would do the same thing. There is a lot of information laid out here that's been before us before and some is new, some is not. But I think now it's time for Commissioners to move on and make some decisions here. MR. JOSHI: Thank you for your time, sir.

here unless you want me to sit --

1 CHAIRMAN SHELTON: No, I want you to stay 2 there in case we have other questions.

MR. ISAACMAN: I'm happy to do it.

CHAIRMAN SHELTON: Commissioners? My question is to staff. No matter what happens here today, my expectation is that we'll look into to see if there's any ownership out of state of the gambling establishment and whether or not I can consider the fact that somebody has been arrested for a felony for licensing and goes to character is debatable in my book. However, I would expect a little background check on this arrest and the outcome of that and if there's a conviction.

Knowing you folks, I know that if there's something like that happens no matter what, you'd bring it back before the Commission for the appropriate action to be taken. Having said that, I can't remove father from son, no matter what. And this case is so obvious of the influence of the father over the son. I don't know what the son has done to show any leadership ability except kind of sit back and eyes and Belize and what's happened in Belize or they're doing something in Las Vegas.

If I go with this, the only thing I can go with is to remove the existing conditions and accept the conditions recommended by staff. So having said that,

starting the conversation, I'll go to my fellow Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: Actually, I was going to ask about the incident in Mexico. I read about that on the Internet. I habitually go to the Internet and type people's names in and just see what's floating out there and this readily popped up and I saw a news clip and all sorts of other things. And, you know, I believe that if part of our world has to do with discretion, that if we read something, a publically available document, I don't see why we can't pull that as a consideration and keep it out there until a resolution is brought forward.

So, Mr. Goodson, would you like to speak to that? It's like reading news articles.

MR. GOODSON: Thank you, Commissioner. And I'm not an expert of Mexican judicial system, but it was my understand, as represented by Mr. Isaacman that the Mexican courts do take a long time, and that the do give people an opportunity to object or be heard or have comments or that sort of thing.

My understanding is that the most recent action that was taken by the Mexican court was to announce that April 20th would be the day that Mr. Hardy, Junior would be released from custody with no charges

1	brought forward and the court is bound by a statutory
2	time line to allow people to comment on that. And
3	that's my most recent knowledge.
4	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: Is that saying he was
5	convicted of something?
6	MR. GOODSON: Not convicted at all, no.
7	Released without charges.
8	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: And how long has he been in
9	jail?
10	MR. GOODSON: He's been in jail since
11	MR. ISAACMAN: July.
12	MR. GOODSON: Is it July?
13	MR. ISAACMAN: Of last year.
14	MR. GOODSON: Yeah. But it's my understanding
15	that the court has announced that, you know, unless
16	absent new information, that it intends to release him
17	without bringing any charges, so there would be no
18	conviction.
19	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: Does that include the
20	other gentleman that was with him?
21	MR. GOODSON: I can't comment on the other
22	gentleman, I don't know the answer to that. I don't
23	represent them.
24	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: All right. I know, it
25	just seemed from the news story

MR. GOODSON: Yeah, sure. Understood, and I've read the same stories, yeah.

1

2

3

4

5

б

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN SHELTON: Don't leave yet. I'm interested in Commissioner Shimazu's approach, if we ordered this to be paid off, do you feel that would sever relationships from Senior?

COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Well, I was going to comment on Mr. Joshi's statement that, you know, I'm not naive, I do understand that there are kind of two issues but I look at them kind of separately to the financial aspect of it. And there was so evidence or just paper that we got about all these inquiries from Hardy, Senior, and I thought, well, I understand why he's asking about that, but I also understand that yes, you can't separate the father and the son and that's fine, it's not going to be the same with every father son relationship. We're going to look at how much control and how much influence the father actually has over this So yes, he has been, I know he's been in the military, I know he has worked, but then you have to go back to that well, where has he worked? He's worked for his father, he still works for his father, so those are the kind of things that I look to see how much, you know, is he really going to influence his son or --?

MR. GOODSON: And Commissioner, I understand

that. And, you know, I would like to clarify that. My statement was you're not going to separate the father from the son from a familial sense.

COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Sure.

MR. GOODSON: But when you're talking about the actions in the business, clearly, removing conditions from this license or granting full license status to Mr. Hardy, Junior, does not obviate your power under the Gambling Control Act to monitor the heck out of this club. You've got the Bureau of Gambling Control sitting right here chomping at the bits to go out there and monitor for compliance. If there's no statutory basis, if there's no factual basis for conditions, you still have the tool of compliance.

The granting of the license doesn't take away your power under the act, to make sure that one, Hardy, Senior isn't involved, and two, Hardy, Junior doesn't do something contrary to any law, not just the Gambling Control Act, and three, Deitch doesn't just do something to any law, not just the Gambling Control Act.

Remember, these are business people. As I explained before, Mr. Deitch has over 35 years of business experience. He is a very wealthy man in his own right. He had held privileged licenses before. To act on behalf of George Hardy, Senior puts his own

interest in this club at risk. It is a bad business decision. It is contrary to 35 years of business history.

COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Yeah, and I am not looking at Mr. Deitch as the trustee or even not licensing the trust, it's the issue of the conditions and I think that you said that he really doesn't any control over, he just — and he's not going to be back in the country, he's not going to be taking a role, so what harm is it to have the conditions remain, or the new conditions because I know they're tailored and written a little better.

MR. GOODSON: And as I said before,

Commissioner Shimazu, the harm is he's been stung once,

he's had somebody sit in the capacity of a fiduciary and

he believes that duty was breached.

CHAIRMAN SHELTON: You know, Mr. Goodson, I still have a problem with that because I have a family trust. If my children don't like the way I spend my money, tough. They don't get anything if I did if I spend it all. And so I'm sitting here saying, why in the world are we even licensing this guy? You know, we're going back and reaching down into a trust and bringing a dependant up and we're licensing him. I know we've done it in the past and we've called for it,

+ 1	but
2	MR. GOODSON: But Chairman Shelton
3	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: it brings up a lot of
4	questions in my mind.
5	MR. GOODSON: the duty of the trustee to
6	the trust is one of a fiduciary, and using it as your
7	own personal checkbook, in the context of this
8	particular event, may constitute a breach of that duty.
9	Now, it may be that you set up the trust, a
10	family trust, and put yourself in as the trustee with a
11	notion that you can use that trust money as you please
12	and that your heirs are the contingent beneficiaries
13	upon your passing and the passing of your wife, we have
14	a business arrangement here. This is the trust that was
15	set up as an estate planning mechanism, but it's asset
16	is an interest in a business. And to allow the trustee
17	to squander the revenues that would go into that trust
18	for his or her own personal benefit, is a breach of the
19	duty to that trust, and then to the trust beneficiary.
20	And that's where the difference is.
21	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: Well, you're giving me an
22	education, but I've got to tell you, at my house, I
23	don't have sole say on how the money is spent.
24	MR. GOODSON: And you're not alone there.

He's on a control

COMMISSIONER VUKSICH:

1	system. But again, I go back to that. Mr. Hardy,
2	Junior has a course for remedy and that is to replace
3	the trustee which he has done, and he has a new it
4	doesn't go there's a firewall set up there, and he
5	still maintains his ability receive that benefit from
б	the trust as beneficiary -
7	MR. GOODSON: You know, Commissioner
8	Vuksich
9	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: having been a
10	beneficiary of that trust.
11	MR. GOODSON: And I understand what you're
12	saying. The problem that we have here is that in the
13	arrangement of the removed trustee and the duty to the
14	trust, the beneficiary didn't get that which he is
15	supposed to get. The distributions didn't flow down to
16	him. And so he has a remedy at law, or he has an
17	equitable remedy, but the harm is already done if you
18	don't get any money.
19	This past year, distributions weren't made and
20	yet the trust declared an income leaving the beneficiary
21	in a position of having to pay over \$400,000 in income
22	tax with no money to pay it. That's the problem. The
23	problem he has a remedy and now we're being attacked
24	because they exercised that remedy. We're being accused

of somehow of falling victims to something orchestrated

1	by Hardy, Senior because he exercised that remedy. But
2	the remedy doesn't give him the money that he needs to
3	pay his tax obligation. And so you're right, we have
4	this legal fix but the practical effect is devastating.
5	MR. JOSHI: Commissioners, can I say
6	something?
7	MR. ISAACMAN: I just have one quick response
8	here.
9	MR. JOSHI: Sorry.
10	MR. ISAACMAN: And that is that the Mr.
11	Goodson seems to suggest that let the conditions be
12	lifting, let the license go to Junior as the beneficiary
13	and as long as the casino is operating in accordance
14	with the law you can monitor that and there's no
15	problem. So the answer seems to be let Hardy, Senior
16	remain as a shadow owner, in effect, not be licensed, as
17	long as he's (inaudible) owner, he's not out front, he
18	doesn't announce from the rooftops that he's pulling the
19	strings, he just has his son tell the trustee what to do
20	and everything is okay as long as the casino doesn't
21	operate in violation of the law.
22	But the big problem we're having and everybody
23	is struggling with this thing because it's a very
24	difficult situation, is because the fundamentals of it

are misplaced. The fundamentals of it have problems in

structure, and that is that we have a close father and son, a son who is dependant only on the father, and this father is not licensable, you just can't allow the son to be there in a position where he is a beneficiary fo 42% in a card club trust. You can't do it. I mean, even if you just change as a trustee, every time the trustee, if the trustee doesn't do his bidding, he changes him so he's controlling it.

And Mr. Goodson says, well, look, he doesn't get the money in time to pay his taxes, but who said to put a trust into a regulated business like this? He doesn't have to do that. He can go do it somewhere else.

The problem is that fundamentally, not matter what you do, as long as you license this trust, there's going to be a problem because Senior will be pulling the strings and controlling the shots and there's no way you're going to monitor that. You're never going to find out. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SHELTON: Commissioners?

MS. MACHUCHI: Commissioners, Evelyn Machuchi, Chief Counsel. I just wanted to make a couple of points. We did ask on these two loans what was owed. We did get some information. Yesterday the Bureau

1	helped us get information from Emily Quickie.
2	Apparently, on the \$325,000 loan to the trust, \$374,447
3	has been paid on that. The loan was \$325,000 plus 10%
4	interest. The loan was originally from 2000 and was
5	supposed to be paid off in 2003 but was not paid off in
6	that time frame so there's a lot of interest that was
7	added on. And the total we have as being owed is
8	\$504,547. So \$374,000 has been paid, \$504,000 is owed
9	and that is information that was received from Emily
10	Quickie.
11	MR. ISAACMAN: I think there's a little bit of
12	a mistake. I think the total balance got to \$504,000,
13	374,000 was paid, the balance is somewhere under
14	\$200,000.
15	MS. MACHUCHI: Right, that's what I'm saying.
16	MR. ISAACMAN: Oh, I misunderstood.
17	MS. MACHUCHI: Three hundred and seventy-four
1.8	thousand has been paid on the loan, five hundred and
19	four thousand was owed, with interest owed. So whatever
20	the difference is between \$374,000 and \$504,000 is
21	what's owed on the \$325,000 original loan.
22	On the other loan was \$860,000 plus interest
23	and according to Mr. Blackman, Mr. Isaacman's partner,
24	\$164,115 is owed and that it's supposed to be paid off

by October of 2009. So \$164,000 is still owed on the

\$860,000 to Wizard Gaming.

And as the other question that Commissioner

Vuksich asked about the arrest, as you know, we've had

this discussion before and has come up before and we are

very concerned about the Commissioners taking into

consideration an arrest because you have no idea whether

or not, you know, it's a totally false arrest or in

particularly, I'm sorry to say this, but perhaps in

Mexico it's not quite the same standards that we have

here in the United States. So I would like you to be

careful about that.

We can consider character and conduct but the problem with that is you have to have that proved here. We would have to have people come testify here that in fact this has occurred. Because all you're looking at is the newspaper and we have no idea whether or not the newspaper is reporting this correctly, you know, what exactly happened here. So it's just a very fine line that I caution you to be very careful.

COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: And that's my question. It's not the arrest, per se, it's the knowledge of a story that could lead to a question about character.

MS. MACHUCHI: Right. But I think we would have to have, you know, actual testimony here to show exactly what happened so that you could actually see, in

1	fact, was this conduct occurred or not. Because I did
2	go on the Internet too and it said that Mr. Hardy
3	crossed over the border, he had a gun in his possession
4	walked into the border patrol or whatever it is in
5	Mexico and handed over his gun.
6	So that's a totally different story than
7	running across the border with a gun and shooting at
8	someone. So, I mean, we really have to be very careful
9	about what exactly happened here. So I just wanted to
10	caution Commissioners on that.
11	MR. GOODSON: Can I ask, since the applicant
12	has the burden of proof, can't he be asked to come in
13	and answer the questions about what happened?
14	MS. MACHUCHI: Well, obviously that's a little
15	difficult if he's in jail in Mexico.
16	MR. GOODSON: Well, if he's asking for a
17	license and has to the burden of proof and he has good
18	character and you have this indication of this bad
19	conduct, can't he come in and say, look satisfy us
20	because it is your burden to prove that you have a
21	character?
22	MS. MACHUCHI: Well, again, we can't order him
23	here from Mexico and tell the Mexican court to release
24	him. You know, I don't think we have subpoena power

25

into Mexico.

1	MR. GOODSON: But he's asking for the license.
2	You can say we're not giving you the license until you
3	satisfy us, and in fact, you're not supposed to give a
4	license until he satisfies you in your discretion that
5	he has acted appropriately and he does have good general
6	character and he's been qualified to engage in a
7	controlled gambling operation. That's that statute.
8	MS. MACHUCHI: I understand that. And also
9	the section that you cited, Mr. Isaacman, doesn't apply
10	to licensee's that applies to gambling businesses. So
11	the section that you cited in the Regulations is not
12	applicable to this person on the firearms conviction,
13	that's a regulation that applies to third party prop
14	(phonetic) players and gambling businesses.
15	MR. ISAACMAN: Chairman Shelton, can I make
16	one little comment?
17	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: No, I've heard enough. I
18	have heard enough. I appreciate it.
19	MR. ISAACMAN: Well, it has to do with the
20	trustee issue that Mr. Goodson 30 seconds.
21	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: We've heard enough, thank
22	you.
23	MR. ISAACMAN: Okay.
24	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: If this Commission can't
0 E	make a decision on the information before it then up

shouldn't be sitting here.

And Legal, I want you to understand in the five years plus I've sat here, we've never made a decision based on anything but the legal information before this Commissioner. Although we -- and have not considered information we're not supposed to consider, so I want that on record. I don't want anybody in this room to think we have. In fact, we have not.

MS. MACHUCHI: Mr. Chair, I would want to clarify I wasn't implying --

CHAIRMAN SHELTON: I understand that, but it's on record and I have to make sure I verify the record and what's being said, in my opinion. And that's some leeway I take. I'm prepared to make a motion and if anybody wants to amend that motion, I'm open to amendment, but we can't beat this thing all day. I'm making a motion to remove the recommendations or the conditions that were originally on and to insert the conditions recommended by legal. Now, if anybody wants to talk financially and add payoffs to it, I'll certainly consider that.

COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Okay, well, I'll second it so we can talk about it. Yeah, originally, I was thinking too, yeah, let's pay off these loans because, let me back up to that. It wasn't the financial issues,

okay, I understand the whole why -- I understand why George Hardy, Senior is asking about it. He just wants his money. That's one thing you can eliminate all that if he gets him money. But that does not go to any conversations he has with his son, we can't monitor that, the Bureau can't monitor that.

Normally, I would say I'm going to look at the relationship, I'm going to look at the individuals. And here, the -- Mr. Hardy, Junior seems to have a certain dependance on his father. He lives with him, he works for him and those were kind of issues, it doesn't seem like he was out there doing his own thing, and that's why I think he could be more easily influenced than just, you know, I mean, looking at different father and son relationships.

I would not vote to not license the trust. I think it's been in place for a while and that that should continue on and Hardy, Junior should continue to get his money. I'm fine with that. But it does bring up all the issues brought up about what if Hardy, Senior is really controlling his son. And again, I don't -- I can't tap into their phones and hear what they're talking about. It's just looking at the facts and how he does seem to rely on his father, so that's what that's based on. I think it would eliminate, it would

be in everyone's best interest to pay off the loans so that you don't have that additional, you know, where he's calling all the time and bugging you about paying it off because then it confuses the situation even more and, yes, you, Wizard needs to, you know, have a wall between you too. Having all those conversations with them doesn't serve anyone any good, so getting him out of the picture, I'm not going to ask for an additional condition, I would just recommend very strongly that that happen, those loans get paid off so we don't have to keep hearing all this stuff again. That's me.

COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: I go back to the first time I became familiar with this club which was in 2006, and the granting of the license to Zephyr and putting the conditions on that license, to me, accomplished what I thought was a way for Mr. Hardy to provide for his son and keep the integrity of the business relationships here, and I think getting rid of these loans helps to clarify those relationships and keep the fire walls clear. And I would like to -- there is nothing about Mr. Hardy, Junior, informationally, that is different from 2006, when his name first crossed my paper. So there are no changes there and I would like to give a little space for these relationships and the shareholders to shake out a little bit before we

_	consider taking these conditions off. And that would be
2	my only comment here.
3	COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: You want the original
4	conditions or the
5	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: No, no,
6	COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Okay.
7	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: Yes, I'm sorry. The
8	new staff conditions.
9	COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Okay. I do want to
10	say, Mr. Goodson, you did address, I mean, I wasn't
11	here in 2006, so I looked at the transcript and those
12	seem to be the two issues that came up, the tax thing,
13	the mental capacity, the capability, whatever, and I
14	think you addressed those.
15	My whole thing was, separate from those two
16	issues, and that was just he influence of Hardy, Senior.
17	Everyone talks about the black cloud and it was hard
18	it's hard to ignore given his history and the
19	relationship with his son.
20	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: Call for the vote.
21	CLERK: Excuse me, Chairman, could we go over
22	the motion again?
23	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: The motion is to strike the
24	existing conditions and add the conditions recommended
25	by legal.

1	CLERK: Okay. Commissioner Shimazu?
2	COMMISSIONER SHIMAZU: Aye.
3	CLERK: Commissioner Vuksich?
4	COMMISSIONER VUKSICH: Aye.
5	CLERK: Chairman Shelton?
6	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: Aye.
7	CLERK: Motion carries.
8	CHAIRMAN SHELTON: Thank you, gentlemen,
9	appreciate it. You both did an outstanding job.
10	MR. ISAACMAN: Thank you.
11	MR. GOODSON: Thank you.
12	END ITEM 4B
13	~~000

Northern California Court Reporters (916) 485-4949

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Michelle Wassum, a duly designated transcriber of Northern California Court Reporters, do hereby declare and certify under penalty of perjury that I have transcribed a tape-recording of the dialog contained herein, and that the foregoing pages constitute a true, complete and accurate transcription to the best of my ability.

Signed on March 31, 2009, at Sacramento, California.

Michelle Wassen

MICHELLE WASSUM, Transcriber

Northern California Court Reporters